DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 424 UD 015 564

AUTHOR Hauser, Robert M.; Featherman, David L.
TITLE Changes in Socioeconomic Stratification of the Races, 1962-1973. Working Paper No. 75-26.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Center for Demography and Ecology.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, Md.; National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Coll. of Agricultural and Life Sciences.; Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Inst. for Research on Poverty.
REPORT NO CDE-WP-75-26
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 50p.; Revised version of papers presented at a conference on Social Demography (Madison, Wisconsin, July 15, 1975) and the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (San Francisco, California, August 28, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Age Differences; Census Figures; *Demography; Economic Factors; Family Role; Labor Force; Longitudinal Studies; National Surveys; *Occupational Surveys; *Racial Differences; School Role; Social Differences; Social Structure; *Socioeconomic Status; Statistical Analysis

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on changes in the occupational levels of black and white men in the decade between 1962 and 1973. For each race taken separately, and then for both in comparison, shifts are described in the mean levels and a dispersion of occupational socioeconomic status of men in the experienced civilian labor force. An attempt is made, it is stated, to account for these intercohort and racial shifts in terms of commensurate compositional changes in factors of family background and regular schooling. An inquiry is made into the allocative processes which distribute men into their current occupational statuses from their family backgrounds and in terms of their schooling. These allocative processes are understood as the basis of social differentiation and inequality, and they are called processes of socioeconomic stratification. New data has been made available, and partly analyzed here about the socioeconomic origins and destinations of black and white men based on a 1973 replicate of the 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation Survey (OCG). These data are considered to provide clearer insights about the sources of socioeconomic change for both races. They also permit some purportedly intriguing speculations about the course of racial inequality and about the evolving roles of families and schools in a maturing, postindustrial society. (Author/JM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED113424

Center for Demography and Ecology

The University of Wisconsin--Madison

Changes in the Socioeconomic Stratification of the Races, 1962-1973

David L. Featherman
and
Robert M. Hauser

Working Paper #75-26

UD015564

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

2

Revision and condensation of presentations at the Conference on Social Demography, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 16 July 1975, and the session on Social Mobility, American Sociological Association meetings, San Francisco, 28 August 1975. This work reflects support from the National Science Foundation (GI-44336), the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (HD-05876), the Institute for Research on Poverty, and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences of the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Introduction

One of the most persistent cleavages in the social fabric of U.S. society is associated with the racial characteristics of persons, groups, and neighborhoods. Recent studies of school and residential segregation in major cities find little amelioration since the mid-'50s (Farley and Taeuber, 1974), despite the enactment of civil rights legislation in the '60s, the general rise in the socioeconomic circumstances of blacks in the last twenty years (Farley and Hermalin, 1972), and the substantial potential for residential integration which follows from these economic trends (Hermalin and Farley, 1973). These concrete realities take on greater significance when seen against apparent shifts in white attitudes toward racial integration (Greeley and Sheatsley, 1971; Hermalin and Farley, 1973). Such disjunctions between public opinion and behavior are, of course, not new, but they underscore the concern expressed recently by social commentators (U.S. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968) and social scientists alike about the potential volatility of racial relations in this country and of the apparent tendency for the races to be moving apart--residentially (Hermalin and Farley, 1973) if not also in terms of public attitudes and sentiments.

Whether we speak of the quality of housing, of employment status, of educational attainment, of occupational level, or of earnings, the importance of socioeconomic information for the assessment of the tone of racial relations cannot be minimized. Significant portions of life style and public attitudes tend to reflect these socioeconomic circumstances, and civil disorder (at least its severity) seems to covary with racial inequalities in strategic socioeconomic conditions (Morgan and Clark, 1973).

More generally, the racial (ethnic) dimension is fundamental to social structure, as well as to the political climate of the society. Of all the salient axes of social differentiation (e.g., age, sex, class), ethnicity (and we take race as an instance of ethnicity) is unique in its potential for political mobilization, with movements to create and maintain separate nation-states serving as clear illustration (Lieberson, 1970). In addition, ethnic inequality and stratification affect other elements of social structure. They can alter relations among economic classes (Barth, 1969; Hechter, 1971, 1974); they can provide for differential patterns and rates of industrial-occupational growth (Hodge and Hodge, 1965). In short, consideration of the racial dimension in studies of inequality and stratification in the U.S. is essential, particularly for understanding and interpreting changes in allocative (distributive) processes.

In this paper, we focus on changes in the occupational levels of black and white men in the last decade, namely, between 1962 and 1973. For each race taken separately, and then for both in comparison, we describe shifts in the mean levels and dispersion of occupational socioeconomic status of men in the experienced civilian labor force. We attempt to account for these intercohort and racial shifts in terms of commensurate compositional changes in factors of family background and regular schooling. Last, and perhaps most importantly, we inquire into the allocative processes which distribute men into their current occupational statuses from their family backgrounds and in terms of their schooling. We understand those allocative processes as the basis of social differentiation and inequality, and we call them processes of socioeconomic stratification

(Duncan, 1968c). In the decade of the '60s, processes of stratification were different for the two major races of U.S. men, defining a situation of inequality of opportunity for socioeconomic achievement for blacks and whites (Duncan, 1967; 1968a). Whether these different allocative processes have changed toward a more universal pattern is as important as whether the racial gap in status has narrowed over the decade, for each datum refers to a different feature of status inequality in U.S. society; change in level need not necessarily imply change in process, and vice versa.

Recent assessments of socioeconomic trends for the races have noted selective improvements for blacks, both in absolute and relative terms (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975; Farley and Hermalin, 1972). A few studies have analyzed change in terms of compositional shifts in both socioeconomic background and schooling and as a function of changing rates of return to family and school characteristics of individuals (e.g. Hauser and Featherman, 1974a; 1974b). These studies indicate that in the last decade blacks have gained ground on whites in schooling, occupational status, and income, although the improvements were relatively greater for the young and in some instances among women only. With respect to occupation distributions, both black and white men experienced a net upward status shift in both the manual and nonmanual categories of the experienced civilian labor force, a decline in farming and self-employment, and a rise in salaried professions and managerial roles. Relative to whites, black men experienced intercohort gains in those occupational categories which were stable or declining in size between the early '60s and early '70s. These shifts were less responsive to the increased favorableness of the socioeconomic

backgrounds of recent cohorts of black men (and white men) than to what appear as changes in the patterns of career mobility in the last decade. For both races, the process of stratification--the mechanisms of allocating men to their current occupational statuses in terms of their schooling and socioeconomic origins--apears to be changing. For example, white men seem to require more formal education to hold the same jobs that same-aged cohorts held a decade ago. For blacks, however, change in the conversion of family resources and schooling into occupational status has not eliminated discrimination, which constrains black men to lower positions than their stocks of human capital equip them to hold.

Generalizations about the sources of changing socioeconomic distributions for the races such as the foregoing are speculative insofar as they have rested upon inferences or projections from baseline studies. Hauser and Featherman (1974a), for example, used the 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation (OCG) survey (Blau and Duncan, 1967) to estimate the occupational destinations of black and white cohorts in 1972 had they experienced the same allocative processes as operated for men in 1962. Comparing the projected destinations with actual distributions reported in the March 1972 Current Population Survey (CPS) and finding discrepancies, Hauser and Featherman inferred that change in racial stratification had occurred. Such indirect techniques of establishing change and of attempting to account for it are obviated by the availability of new data about the socioeconomic origins and destinations of black and white men based on a 1973 replicate of the 1962 OCG survey. These data provide clearer insights about the sources of socioeconomic change for both races. They also permit some intriguing speculations about the course of racial inequality and about

the evolving roles of families and schools in a maturing, post-industrial economy.

Data

Both the 1962 OCG survey and its 1973 replicate were carried out in conjunction with the March demographic supplement to the Current Population Survey in those two years (Blau and Duncan, 1967; Featherman and Hauser, 1975a). The 1962 survey had a response rate of 83% to a four-page questionnaire which was left behind by the CPS interviewer. More than 20,000 men in the civilian noninstitutional population responded. In 1973, the eight-page OCG questionnaire was mailed out six months after the March CPS and was followed by mail, telephone and personal call-backs. The respondents, comprising 88% of the target sample, included more than 33,500 men aged 20 to 65 in the civilian noninstitutional population. Also, in the 1973 sample, blacks and persons of Spanish origin were sampled at about twice the rate of whites, and almost half the black men were interviewed personally. In this paper we shall effect age-constant intercohort comparisons among men in the post-schooling, economically active years; therefore, we limit our analysis to men aged 25-64 in the experienced civilian labor forces of March 1962 and March 1973.

Unfortunately, in both OCG samples, women are represented only through their husbands. That is, socioeconomic background characteristics of women were elicited only if they were married and living with their husbands. While we have examined comparable tabulations of the educational, occupational, and earnings attainments for the male and female married, spouse-present populations (Featherman and Hauser, 1975b), we shall not present them here.

(Caveat. Despite our considerable efforts to insure replicability in the 1973 survey, we have concerns that methods or survey effects may confound our assessment of real change. In particular, we are evaluating intracohort evidence which indicates apparent instrument differences in occupation responses. Without attempting to detail the possible sources of these artifacts, suffice it to say that procedural changes within the structure of occupation, industry, and class of worker questions on the CPS questionnaire between March 1962 and March 1973 now seem to frustrate exact replication. This occurs inspite of our effort to recover comparability through the coding of these materials into a common classification system--as given in the 1960 Index of Occupations and Industries--and a common metric of socioeconomic status. In view of our lingering uncertainty about the basis of these apparent failures to replicate, we concentrate our analysis on racial differentials within both surveys and on changes in these differentials.)

Intercohort Shifts in Occupational Socioeconomic Status

Following a pattern established in at least the last twenty years, the net intercohort shifts in current occupational socioeconomic status [in units of Duncan's (1961) socioeconomic index for detailed occupation titles] has been upward for both whites (Table 1) and blacks (Table 2) at all ages. For whites aged 25-64 in the experienced civilian labor force (ECLF), the rise of 3.33 points on the Duncan scale between 1962 and 1973 represented a shift of about 14% of the 1962 standard deviation. Larger than average intercohort improvements in current status were experienced by white men in the middle years--ages 35-54, while the youngest and oldest

age groups had smaller gains, especially when expressed in units of their 1962 standard deviations (9% and 7%, respectively). Small upward changes in average status stemming from paternal (family head's) occupation typified white men, with such improvements in the family of origin's socioeconomic status being confined to the men aged 25-34 in both surveys. Over the decade, inequality among whites arising from occupational socioeconomic status remained virtually constant, as seen in the coefficients of variation in Table 1.

At every age, black men (Table 2) enjoyed larger absolute and relative upward shifts in current occupational status than did whites. For example, the roughly 8 point rise in average status for the black aged 25-64 was almost two and one-half times the gain for whites, and it represented an improvement equal to 53% of the black standard deviation in 1962. Absolute and relative gains fluctuate regularly with age among blacks, wich larger improvements vested in young experienced workers.[1] These changes could hardly have followed from alterations in the socioeconomic circumstances of the families in which these blacks were reared, as net shifts in paternal (head's) status were not salutary, especially at the two oldest ages.[2] Absolute variation (standard deviation) in status derived from the family of orientation and from current occupation increased for blacks at every age over the decade; inequality measured relative to mean current status (coefficient of variation) declined, however, especially at ages 25-34. Relative variance in parental status increased for the middle ages 35-54.

Of course, gains for blacks must be viewed in the context of their historically subordinate status position relative to whites. At every age and for both paternal and current occupational statuses, blacks in 1973 occupied a lower socioeconomic level than did whites of comparable ages

eleven years earlier. Still, racial gaps in current socioeconomic status arising from jobs have shrunk (Table 3, column of changing mean racial differences)--nearly eight and one-half points on the Duncan scale at ages 25-34 and four and one-half points for total men aged 25-64. Put into perspective, these declines are 38% and 22% of their respective mean racial gaps in 1962. At the same time, however, blacks lost ground to whites in socioeconomic background, as all but the group aged 35-44 in 1973 were reared in relatively less beneficial socioeconomic arrangements than blacks in 1962.

Historically, absolute variation in current socioeconomic status has been greater for whites than blacks, reflecting greater differentiation in the white occupation distribution. Relative to the respective racial means, however, inequality of occupational status has been and is greater for blacks. Shifts in differential status inequality have occurred since 1962, as the ratio of the black to white standard deviations has risen from .62 to .81 for men aged 25-64 in the ECLF. That differentiation and status inequality in the two racial occupation distributions have drawn somewhat closer is also apparent in the smaller differences in their coefficients of variation (Table 3).

Even as blacks have become less equal to whites in terms of their socioeconomic backgrounds, black men in the ECLF of 1973 are more likely to have experienced intergeneration status mobility like that which characterizes whites. Table 4 reorganizes Tables 1 and 2 by comparing the status of a man's current occupation with that of his father's as an index of status mobility in the life cycle (i.e., between age sixteen and age at the survey date).[3] In 1962, black men of all ages, except those aged

35-44, were not able to advance in the status hierarchy much beyond the positions of their family heads. (This is not to say that black men tended to "inherit" the occupations--to go into the same general line of work--as their fathers; if anything, the facts are to the contrary. See Duncan, 1968c; Hauser, Featherman, and Hogan, forthcoming.) Whites, however, tended to be upwardly mobile over their life cycles as they left the family of orientation. In 1973, the upward intergeneration mobility of whites continued in roughly the same amounts, but black men were far more likely to be upwardly mobile than their counterparts a decade earlier. In fact, at ages 35-44, the absolute amount of intergeneration mobility in the black population is slightly greater than in the white (14.46 vs. 11.34 points on the Duncan SEI). Thus, black men recently have begun to experience status mobility in their life cycles which more closely duplicates the circumstances of whites. However, cohorts of blacks in 1973 began their life cycles in families which were competitively less beneficial (vis-a-vis whites) than did cohorts in 1962. Therefore, the racial change over the decade in intergeneration mobility seems to reflect the larger intercohort shifts in current job statuses which have typified blacks.

Intercohort Changes in Socioeconomic Background and Education

If there have been racial differentials in intercohort changes in paternal occupational status, there were greater similarities in shifts among other family factors and education for the two races between 1962 and 1973. (See Table 5.)[4] Blacks and whites in the ECLF of 1973 were reared in smaller families in which the heads were better educated and more likely to be employed in nonfarm jobs than were same-aged men in the ECLF of 1962.

Only with respect to rearing in intact vs. broken families were cohorts of both races not exposed to family conditions more conducive to higher occupational attainment than were men a decade earlier. In addition, rising mean education was experienced at all ages in both races. The average increase for men aged 25-64 was 1.05 years among whites and 2.08 years among blacks. (See Hauser and Featherman, 1975, for a detailed analysis of trends in schooling.)

To put these shifts into relative perspective, we note that the family circumstances in which black cohorts in the 1973 study were reared were less salutary than those for white men in the 1962 study (compare means in 1973 column for blacks with means in 1962 column for whites in Table 5). Blacks still suffer a relative handicap to socioeconomic achievement stemming from their family backgrounds, despite the fact that recent cohorts of blacks have grown up in improved socioeconomic conditions (especially with respect to the proportion with nonfarm origins and non-South region of birth; for the latter statistic, see Hauser and Featherman, 1975).

At the same time racial differentials in schooling seem to be disappearing. Whereas the difference in mean education was 3.02 years in 1962 for men aged 25-64 in the ECLF, the gap was 1.99 years in 1973. Moreover, among men aged 25-34 in 1973, the racial gap is the narrowest at 1.15 years, and the black mean is 91% of the white average (as compared to 81% in 1962). Thus declining differentials in schooling especially at the youngest ages in Table 5 parallel declines in occupational socioeconomic status discussed in Table 3. We shall defer a discussion of the contributions of intercohort shifts in family socioeconomic factors and education to

racial differentials in occupational status until we have examined regression estimates of our basic model of the process of occupational stratification for change over the decade.

Processes of Socioeconomic Allocation in 1962 and 1973

In Tables 6 and 7 we have elaborated the "basic" model of Blau and Duncan (1967: Chapter 5) for the process of occupational stratification to include a somewhat broader array of family background factors. Table 6 gives estimates of the reduced-form equation relating five exogenous, predetermined family factors to occupational socioeconomic status. Table 7 reports estimates of our full model, with education included as an endogenous regressor. (We do not include first job in our full model, as this item is not a replicate of the 1962 instrument; see Featherman and Hauser, 1975a. Analysis of the education equation appears in Hauser and Featherman, 1975.)

In the reduced-form equation for current occupational status (Table 6) we find the now rather familiar pattern of relationships between family background and occupation among white men in the 1962 ECLF. Both father's occupation and education made positive contributions to occupational achievement, even if these were small in metric terms. Size of sibship, farm origins and rearing in a broken family all had depressing effects. About 21% of the variance in occupational achievement was explained by these five family factors. Among blacks in 1962, only farm origins and paternal education had statistically significant effects on occupational status; the five family factors accounted for a mere 8% of the variance, except for blacks aged 25-44 for whom the larger handicap of farm origins leads to a higher R^2 (11-12%).

By 1973, the articulation of family background and occupational status decreased slightly at all ages among whites, while it increased for blacks (compare R^2 values by age within race in the year panels of Table 6). Inequality of occupational socioeconomic status conditional upon family origins (as given in the errors of estimate) increased more for blacks than whites, although in an absolute sense the differentiated status opportunities reflected in greater variance were still more characteristic of whites than blacks in 1973.[5] In 1962, the source of about 79% of the variance in occupational status lay outside the family; for blacks the figure was 92%. In 1973, the non-family based variance increased for whites to 82%, but it decreased for blacks to 86%.

A convergence of the racial patterns of occupational stratification is most apparent among men aged 25-34 in 1973, even as distinctive racial differences in family effects persisted into the '70s. (If convergence of purely family-based allocative processes is underway, at least for young blacks and whites in their early careers, their actual attainments show less similarity; the ratio of black-to-white mean SEI for current occupation was 0.45 in 1962 and 0.68 in 1973, for men aged 25-34.) At each age, even outside the group aged 25-34, the black coefficients are more comparable to the white values than in 1962. With the exception of the depressing effect of farm origin, the bearing of each family factor on black achievements has increased over the decade. For whites, increasing negative effects of sibship size, farm origins and broken family were offset by decreases in the positive effects of paternal occupation and education. A noteworthy intercohort change is the declining importance of farm origins for both whites and blacks in the two youngest cohorts.

A fuller model for the occupational stratification of the races is given in Table 7. Persons familiar with the 1962 OCG findings remember that education was a major factor in the hypothetical causal structure of socioeconomic achievement for blacks and whites. For virtually all cohorts in both races, the addition of education to the set of family background regressors nearly doubled R^2, with about 39% of the variance in the occupational statuses of whites and 16% of blacks' statuses being explained by these factors. The contribution of education to variance in occupation, net of family factors, was 48% of total explained variance for both races in 1962.

Of course, the introduction of education into the model of stratification altered the reduced-form coefficients for family effects on achievement in 1962. In brief, the total effects of each family factor were reduced, signalling the importance of schooling as an intervening mechanism (as well as a direct causal agent) of social transmission whereby the effects of family socioeconomic resources and related factors were converted into socioeconomic statuses of the offspring. An illustration of this role of education is the reduction by about 50% of the handicap of farm origins for whites when education is controlled statistically (compare 1962 panels in Tables 6 and 7). Larger reductions occurred for older white men. Practically all (70%) of the negative effect of black farm origins was associated with the lower educational attainments of black farm boys in 1962; the positive statistical effect of paternal education was also "explained" by the relationship between this family factor and schooling differentials among black men.

These same (hypothetical) causal relationships reappear in the 1973 data, although the impact of schooling on the occupational achievements

of both races has increased over the decade (compare year panels in Table 7). Perhaps the most important intercohort change in Table 7 is the increase in the total effect of education. For white men aged 25-64 in the 1962 ECLF, each additional year of schooling was worth 3.6 points on the Duncan SEI scale; the black coefficient, about one-third the size of the white value, coverted to 1.3 SEI points per each increment of schooling, among black men of equivalent family backgrounds. Larger differentials in occupational "returns" to schooling were found among the younger men. By 1973, the absolute effect of schooling on the occupational statuses of whites aged 25-64 in the ECLF increased 17% (coefficient of 4.3) and the increase for blacks was 55% (coefficient of 2.6); the relative size of the black "return" to schooling increased to 63% of the white value. Younger blacks and whites were more likely to experience similar occupational returns to each year of schooling; this marks a reversal of the 1962 age pattern.

In fact, young workers, especially those aged 25-34, are far less differentiated by race than a decade earlier, as we examine the model of stratification proposed by Table 7 for 1973. Apart from the remaining differences in the education coefficients (about 1 point on the SEI per each increment in schooling), the effects of net family factors are rather similar, if not in absolute size, than in the fact that they are not significant statistically (although some of the racial differences among these virtually zero coefficients are different statistically). At least at these younger ages, evidence for convergence of the allocative mechanisms, if not for complete equality of occupational opportunity, does appear.

As intercohort change has brought greater "returns" to schooling, so too has it enlarged the proportion of explained variance in occupational

status attributable to education net of family background. About 38% of variance in white achievement and 30% of variance in black attainment is explained in 1973. Note that R^2 decreased trivially for whites (R^2 = .387 vs. .377) and increased substantially blacks (R^2 = .160 vs. .297) in the ECLF over the decade. Of these variances, some 52% and 54% is assignable to the unique effect of schooling for whites and blacks, respectively. [The figure for both races in 1962 was 48%.] Larger effects for education appear for the two youngest ages of both races.

Intercohort changes in socioeconomic stratification have increased occupational inequality (conditional on background and schooling) at all ages for both races (compare errors of estimate in year panels of Table 7). At the same time, the proportion of variance explained by both family background and education has increased for blacks but decreased for whites. Finally, the effects of schooling apart from family factors are greater for both races. Thus, the possible, moderate convergence of blacks and whits with respect to their processes of stratification appears to reveal two opposite trends. First, among whites, a slight attenuation of the social mechanisms which heretofore have permitted families to provide schooling more or less commensurate with their economic, cultural, and social resources and which have linked level of completed schooling to occupational socio-economic statuses for the offspring. In short, for whites there has been a modest weakening of stratification--the linking of one generation to the next. This has occurred without reducing occupational inequality and in conjunction with a greater role of education (relative to family background) in the generation of socioeconomic differences among whites. In effect, mechanisms which allocate whites to their occupational status are more

egalitarian, meritocratic and less deterministic (by factors in our models) in the mid-'70s than in the '60s.

For blacks, intercohort change has produced a second, more noticeable, and perhaps more socially significant shift. The capacity of families and schools to provide resources which black men can convert into occupational achievements has enlarged. This tighter articulation between family background and achievement begins to fashion a pattern of intergenerational stratification for blacks which obtained a decade ago for whites. At the same time, the relative role of education vis-a-vis the family also has increased since 1962, this in the context of greater inequality in the statuses of blacks of similar social origins and schooling.[6] So, as intergenerational stratification for blacks has increased, the process has also become more meritocratic, as educational credentials begin to mean more for a black in 1973 than in 1962.

Sources of Change in Socioeconomic Differentials

For both blacks and whites, mean socioeconomic statuses of the occupations of men in the ECLF have risen between 1962 and 1973. To what can we attribute these changes? In particular, can intercohort improvements in status be explained by changes in mean levels of family factors and education? In seeking answers to these questions we have standardized our data on the 1973 regression equations for each race taken separately. For example, among blacks aged 25-34, the intercohort shift in mean socioeconomic status was 10.80 SEI points. To decompose this difference, we insert the 1962 means on the black family factors into the reduced-form 1973 regression for blacks aged 25-34 as found in Table 6. The estimated

socioeconomic score is 0.78 points lower than the 1973 observed mean, indicating that about 7% of the intercohort change is associated with shifts in family factors for this age between 1962 and 1973. (See Table 8.) We then insert the relevant means into the full 1973 regression model in Table 7 for this group of blacks. The estimated socioeconomic score is an additional 7.12 points below the 1973 observed mean; thus, shifts in educational attainments over the decade account for some 66% of the total intercohort change in occupational achievement. The remaining 27%, or 2.90 points on the Duncan scale, represents true change in the process of stratification, or in the variable-specific regression estimates between 1962 and 1973, subject to the possibility of change being vested in variables deleted from our prediction equations and/or of interactions among the variables. We repeat this procedure of indirect standardization for each age group in the black sub-sample; then, in the white groups, using the white means and regressions.

From Table 8 which contains the results of this standardization, we note that shifts in family socioeconomic and other statuses account for only a small portion of total intercohort changes in attainment for blacks--about 13% for men in the ages 25-64. A larger percentage of change comes from rising levels of schooling--between 66 and 75 percent--and there is less age variation in this percentage than for the family background components taken as a block. In effect, nearly three-quarters of the upward shift in occupational status for blacks results from increased levels of schooling and small net improvements in family background circumstances. The remaining quarter represents change in the allocative processes which distribute black men from their origins and schooling to hierarchical statuses in the occupational structure. Compositional shifts in family

factors and education are most able to explain intercohort change at ages 35-44 and 55-64. Conversely, true change in the process of stratification itself is most apparent in the youngest group, 25-34, and at ages 45-54.

For whites, the compositional changes in family factors and education are more than enough to account for the small intercohort rises in average socioeconomic status. This fact is apparent from the negative sign on the "residual" components in Table 8. For example, among men in the ages 25-64, intercohort increases in mean schooling account for nearly all (92%) of the total intercohort gain in occupational status. Coupled with rising socioeconomic levels of parental statuses, these changes explain 148% of the intercohort shifts. Thus, whites too have experienced inter-decade modifications in the process of stratification which reflect more than compositional changes in background and education. These modifications are about 25 to 30 percent of total intercohort (absolute) change, or about the same percentage as for blacks. However, change for whites is associated with decreases in education-specific, mean occupational socioeconomic status. That is, white men of all ages in 1973 can expect to hold lower average socioeconomic statuses at each level of schooling than their counterparts in 1962. (Compare Hauser and Featherman, 1974a.) Unlike whites, blacks in 1973 do not have to acquire more education just to stay at the same occupational levels as were same-aged men in 1962. We shall comment later on the significance of these differentials, especially since these shifts in education-specific occupational achievements are coupled with intercohort increases in the occupational "returns" to each year of additional schooling for both whites and blacks.

As for intercohort changes within each race, compositional shifts in family statuses and schooling account for most of the racial differentials in mean occupational status in both 1962 and 1973, as indicated in Table 9. Here, we standardize on the age-specific white regression equations from Tables 6 and 7 for the two years, inserting the black age-specific means into the white equations. The logic of this inter-racial procedure is the same as for the decomposition of the intercohort changes we have just discussed. Following previous usages of this technique of indirect standardization (Duncan, 1968c, a; Hauser and Featherman, 1974a), we interpret the residual difference as a conservative estimate of racial discrimination, or, of inequality of opportunity based on non-familial and non-educational racial factors.

At each age, the racial gap in socioeconomic status as of 1973 reflected family socioeconomic differentials somewhat more clearly than in 1962, particularly for the youngest men. In part, this change from 77% to 50% of the racial difference in occupational status reveals the relative advantages white fathers have afforded their sons in the recent period by virtue of higher mean paternal socioeconomic status. (Recall the discussion of Table 3.) Concurrently, the percentage of the racial gap which reflects mean differences in schooling has declined, substantially so at those youngest ages at which these differences in education have nearly disappeared (see Table 5). Finally, the percentage of the racial difference in occupational status which signifies discrimination has remained constant or is smaller at each age in 1973. Largest declines in both absolute and percentage terms are noted for ages 45-64; although the absolute decline in discrimination is largest at ages 25-34, this group shows little change in the relative

size of the residual component between 1962 and 1973. Despite the decline in the contribution of discrimination to the size of the racial gap over the decade in age-constant comparisons, for total men aged 25-64 in the ECLF the relative force of discrimination has increased from 26% to 35%. This discrepancy between age-specific and total comparisons of the changing role of discrimination most likely reflects changes in the age-race composition of the ECLF between the two surveys.

Last, what portion of the declining racial gap in occupational status, seen most clearly among men in their early work careers, is associated with changing differentials in family socioeconomic statuses and schooling? What portion represents "true" change in socioeconomic stratification? Table 10 provides the analysis of these questions. We have used the age-specific white 1973 regressions in Tables 6 and 7 as the standard. Into these equations, we have inserted the changes in the racial mean differences over the decade, as found in Table 3 (for paternal occupation) and as calculated from Table 5 (for other family factors and education). To interpret Table 10, we observe that the racial gap in occupational status for ages 25-64 has shrunk 4.66 points over the decade (this figure is also found in Table 3). Taking only changes in differentials on family factors into account, we estimate the gap would have increased about one unit on the SEI scale (0.95); but net of these changes, we note a decline in the gap by 3.32 points owing to shifts in schooling differentials. The difference between these net amounts and the observed total change of -4.66 SEI points is -2.29, or the decline in the gap attributable to changing processes of status allocation (stratification) for both races. With the exception of men in the ages 25-34, change in the relative educational attainments of the races is

by itself sufficiently great to account for the closing socioeconomic gap in black and white occupational achievements. Among men aged 35-44, for example, a decline of 5.39 points is expected as a result of changing differentials in schooling, which is larger than the observed decline of 4.49 SEI points. For the youngest workers aged 25-34, the noteworthy shift toward greater educational equality also accounts for a large part of the declining occupational difference; but while the component of this difference which reflects educational change is substantial (5.15 SEI points), it is smaller than the very large net decline in the occupational gap (8.43 points) at these ages.

If changes in the educational compositions of the races are major sources of narrowing occupational status differences, the changing compositions of family factors are sources for a limitation of these declines. At all ages, the relative gains of whites in family contexts more favorable to socioeconomic advancement offset, to a modest degree, the declines in occupational differences which stem from education.

It is among the youngest workers, aged 25-34, that compositional changes in both family and schooling are least able to account for declining racial gaps in occupational status. Obversely, changes in processes of status allocation and intergeneration transmission for black and white workers in their early careers are reflected clearly in these declines among young men in the ECLF. Interestingly, these notable changes in the stratification of the races are accompanied by large declines in the SEI gap itself, signifying that changes both in level of attainment and in the processes of socioeconomic stratification have been most demonstrable among young workers.

Summary, Interpretations, and Speculations

In the decade between 1962 and 1973 both white and black males in the experienced civilian labor force enjoyed a general rise in average socioeconomic status associated with their occupations. Among whites, these gains were concentrated in the middle years of the work career, while

young blacks in the early career experienced the largest improvements in average status. Relative to whites, black workers in 1973 had gained ground, closing the socioeconomic status gap by about 22 percent, with greater equality of attainments among men aged 25-34. Still, socioeconomic statuses of blacks in 1973 fell below the average attainments of whites at every age in 1962.

During the same period, the socioeconomic circumstances of black and white families of origin improved, as did levels of schooling, setting more favorable environments for the social promotion of cohorts in the 1973 study. These more favorable conditions for achievement do not account fully for intercohort shifts in occupational status for either race, indicating that real change in the process of stratification--of status allocation between generation--has occurred.

Change in the process of stratification has followed different patterns for blacks than for whites. Rearing in farm families represents less of an occupational handicap for both races in 1973 than in 1962, and the socioeconomic status "returns" to educational achievement for men of equivalent social backgrounds are greater in the '70s than in the last decade. The enlarged value of each additional year of schooling is more noticeable among blacks than whites and among the youngest workers. Taken as a block, family factors play a somewhat less substantial role in the occupational attainments of whites than in 1962, and the relative importance of education (vis-á-vis the family) has increased. However, the occupational achievements of whites in 1973 are less constrained by socioeconomic background and schooling than in the earlier period. Thus, the process of occupational stratification has become more meritocratic and perhaps more random (with respect to the family and schooling) for whites. Schooling remains as

the single most important element of status allocation, and indeed the value of each additional year of education has increased, even if only slightly, for whites. At the same time, whites completing each grade are unable to convert this resource into occupational statuses at the same level as men in 1962. Therefore, downward shifts in education-specific occupational attainments have occurred since 1962, even as the socioeconomic differentials between educational levels have risen by about 25%.

If the process of stratification has become somewhat more random for whites over the decade, it has grown more deterministic for black men in the ECLF, as both socioeconomic background and especially schooling are more tightly linked to occupational statuses.[7] Families and schools apparently have begun to function in the socioeconomic life cycles of blacks as they did for whites over a decade ago. Greatest racial similarities in status allocation appear among workers in the early careers, the same group for whom the racial gap in occupational socioeconomic status has shrunk the most since 1962. Over the decade, increases in the value of each additional year of education have been large for blacks--nearly 50% higher, but these gains have not eliminated the racial difference in "returns" to schooling. However, blacks have not experienced the downward shift in education-specific occupational status that whites have undergone.

While the racial gap in mean socioeconomic status has declined and while similarities in the process of status allocation for young men of both races are greater, blacks still experience occupational discrimination. There has been little change since 1962 in the percent of the racial gap which we have designated as discrimination. Changes in educational differentials account for a significant portion of the declining gap at all ages. But it is among workers in their early careers that such compositional sources are least able to account for the narrowing (notable at ages 25-34)

of the mean socioeconomic levels of the races. Among these young workers, change in the process of stratification itself, together with the near disappearance of racial differences in education, combine to reduce the occupational status differentials between whites and blacks.

What do these various trends and changes signify for racial or ethnic relations in the U.S.? Unfortunately, there is no simple answer. Even with respect to the limited issue of the "structural integration" (Hechter, 1971) of blacks into the economy, the data are equivocal. On the one hand, the process of intergenerational stratification of the races appears to be moving toward equality, as younger workers seem to be experiencing quite similar allocation from socioeconomic origins to schooling and then into the occupational hierarchy. Differentials in process and level of occupational attainment persist, even among the young, but gaps have declined and inequality of opportunity has diminished. Black families seem increasingly able to transfer their socioeconomic statuses to sons as a means of establishing a semi-permeable floor on which the ladder to upward mobility rests (and which impedes but does not prevent downward mobility). Put another way, economic classes are more visible among the black population now than a decade ago. In addition, young black men have achieved near equality of schooling when compared to whites, and relative to conditions for blacks over a decade ago, increments to regular or formal education provide even better (socioeconomically) jobs at each level of schooling and for each additional year completed.

On the other hand, differentials in "returns" to education and family "resources" remain, as do gaps in average occupational status, especially among older men. Discrimination in the labor market, although perhaps

smaller in absolute size, is not significantly less as a proportion of the total gap in occupational status than a decade ago. In addition, a more favorable socioeconomic position relative to whites has not led automatically to lesser discrimination against blacks in other components of life style and quality, as in the instance of the intransigence of segregated housing. And, even as young blacks in the civilian labor force have gained ground on their white age peers, the likelihood of a young black being in the labor force of 1973 was less than in 1962. In sum, the evidence for trend in structural integration of the races is mixed. It confounds the always problematic associations among cultural, structural, and political integration (Hechter, 1971) and makes predictions about change in racial relations impossible.

Surely racial stratification and inequality persist, even in these "post-industrial" United States. As they do, however, trends in stratification of the races reveal evidence for increased economic "rationality" which places constraints on the effective abilities of the white majority to control the socioeconomic well-being of the black minority, or, to institutionalize the existing stratification system. Proponents of the thesis of industrialism (cf. Treiman (1970) for an overview)--that social change in the United States occurs primarily through industrial transformation and evolution--might be heartened by the diminished role of family factors as education becomes more effective in allocating men to occupational positions in the socioeconomic hierarchy. In that sense, stratification has grown more universalistic. The process is more rational, for example, as it responds to larger cohorts of highly educated whites by raising the educational prerequisites for each occupation (cf. Smelser

and Lipset, 1966; Thurow and Lucas, 1972). Educational upgrading of the occupational hierarchy in the last decade, consistent with the view of rampant credentialism (e.g. Berg, 1970), at the same time is compatible with the contention that economic change since 1962 has increased the premium for higher productivity.[8] This takes the form of greater occupational and earnings differences among persons at each educational level than a decade earlier, as for example, those with higher education are recruited into growth industries, especially in the tertiary sector (see Bell, 1973: Chapter 3).

Blacks have shared in these putative transformations of the economy and in the process of socioeconomic stratification. Proportionately less of the variance we can explain in occupational attainment reflects ascribed (family) factors, as educational achievements of blacks in 1973 become more important in status allocation than a decade earlier. Increasing mean levels of schooling have not raised the educational prerequisites for occupations for blacks as they have for whites: black men were able to obtain higher status jobs at each educational level in 1973 than they could in 1962. Presumably, the demand for well-educated blacks exceeds the supply. At the same time, each increment of schooling brought greater "returns" than a decade ago. Blacks have become more internally differentiated by occupation, creating more distinctive economic strata within the race, with education serving as an effective mechanism allocating persons to jobs.

The converging educational achievements of the races, particularly at the youngest ages, have provided a major impetus to the decline in occupational inequality between black and white men. Among older workers, smaller mean differences in occupational status reflect, in the main, change in the process of stratification itself (versus compositional

changes) over the decade. Thus, greater access to higher education for young blacks and rising mean education levels have accomplished both a reduction of educational inequality and occupational inequality between the races. These shifts run counter to the predictions of Boudon (1974), as does the observation that within-race declines in educational inequality in the U.S. (Hauser and Featherman, 1975) are coincident (a) with stable occupational inequality among whites but increasing inequality among blacks, and (b) with changes in the processes of intergenerational stratification (or mobility) for both races (see Hauser, forthcoming for a fuller critique of the Boudon formulation).

In all of these various shifts and changes, we find little support for a theory of ethnic relations so simple as the following characterization:

> "The uneven wave of industrialization over territorial space creates relatively advanced and less advanced groups, and therefore acute cleavages of interest arise between these groups. As a consequence of this initial fortuitous advantage, there is a crystallization of the unequal distribution of resources and power between the two groups."
>
> "The superordinate group, now ensconced as the core, seeks to stabilize and monopolize its advantages through policies aiming at the institutionalization of the existing stratification system. Ultimately it seeks to regulate the allocation of social roles such that those roles commonly defined as having high status are reserved for its members. Conversely, individuals from the less advanced group are denied access to these roles. This differential distribution of roles and assets may be enforced de jure, when the individual from the disadvantaged group is denied certain roles by the active intervention of the state. This may be termed the racist solution to the maintenance of the stratification system. Or it may be preserved de facto, through policies providing differential access to status-confirming institutions, such as the educational, military, or ecclesiastical systems. Thi solution has recently been termed institutional racism. Both policies ensure that the character of the stratification system is unchanged." (Hechter, 1971:42)

Whatever the source of ascendancy of whites over blacks, whatever the basis of current inequities in economic power, whites have not been able

to monopolize the advantages of socioeconomic change since 1962. Stratification of the black population between generations is beginning to follow a pattern of relationships which tends to characterize majority populations in many industrialized nations (see Featherman, Jones, and Hauser, forthcoming, for a treatment of these commonalities). Meanwhile, white families have not effectively insulated their offspring from the occupational consequences of a burgeoning supply of highly educated workers. As parents of higher socioeconomic means are less able to guarantee the educational attainments of their offspring (Hauser and Featherman, 1975), and as family factors are less functional in the occupational allocation of whites, the efficacy of both race and class as sources of status inequality declines.

FOOTNOTES

[1]In assessing shifts between the OCG surveys, it is important to remember that the civilian noninstitutional population of 1973 covered a larger percentage of (especially younger) cohorts in the ages 25-64 than was covered in 1962. Better coverage stems, in the main, from a smaller Armed Forces. For example, coverage of the ages 25-34 in the 1962 OCG was 91.5%; in 1973, 94.5% of the ages 25-34 were covered in the OCG sample under analysis. The bearing of more extensive coverage via a less extensive Armed Forces on our comparisons is difficult to assess, as the effects are apt to differ for the races. Moreover, our focus on the ECLF compounds the issue, inasmuch as young black men, ages 25-34, were less likely to be in the labor force of 1973 than same-aged men in 1962. In that sense, too, the racial populations covered by the 1973 study are somewhat different from those covered in the 1962 study, especially at the youngest ages.

[2]Inasmuch as nearly half of the black respondents to the 1973 survey were interviewed personally (and all of the 1962 data were elicited by self-enumeration), one might suspect the comparison of the two surveys, especially with regard to paternal occupation. Whether the quality of the 1973 interview and 1973 self-enumeration data is the same is as yet unanalyzed. We plan to rerun the 1973 black data, stripped of the supplementary (interview) cases to see if these and other results are reproduced.

[3]Father's (head's) occupation about son's age sixteen, indexed by the Duncan SEI, is the replicate item indicating the occupational socioeconomic status of the family unit during (most of) the rearing of the respondent--particularly that time at which educational and career plans were being formalized. There is no replicate item for maternal SEI, except when the mother was the head of the family.

[4]Paternal education is scaled in years completed according to the following recode of class intervals: No school, 0.0 years; elementary (1-4), 3.3 years; elementary (5-7), 6.3 years; elementary (8), 8.0 years; high school (1-3), 13.8; college (4), 16.0; college (5 or more), 18.0. Number of siblings is the sum of brothers and sisters (not counting respondent).

Farm origins is a dichotomy, with a score of zero indicting that respondent's father had an occupation as a farmer, farm manager, farm laborer, or farm foreman. Broken family is a dichotomy, with zero indicting that respondent was not living with both parents (however, respondent defined the situation) most of the time up to age 16. Respondent's education is in single years, as reported to the CPS.

[5]The rise in the error or estimate, especially for blacks, signifies greater inequality of occupational status within categories of family socioeconomic statuses in 1973 as compared to 1962. Inasmuch as racial differentials in within-class (family) variance have diminished largely because of changes in the black error estimate, we might regard this as a sign of some note. Coupled with rising R^2 values for the black equations of 1962 and 1973, these data imply that occupational inequalities within and between family categories have increased rather strikingly for blacks. Such conditions are indicative of more viable socioeconomic strata or classes than existed for blacks in the earlier period.

[6]As within-family and -school variation in socioeconomic status has increased for blacks since 1962, the extent to which achievement is restricted by these factors has declined. That is, black occupational attainments are less determinate than a decade ago, when occupational options were attenuated.

[7]Within these categories of family and schooling, however, occupational achievement is <u>less</u> determinate in 1973 than in 1962, even as in both years achievement is more determinate for blacks than whites. See footnote 6.

[8]Competing explanations of these trends in terms of productivity vs. credentialism effects are difficult if not impossible to adjudge. We do note that the predictive power (in R^2) of the family-plus-education equation is less in 1973 than in 1962 for whites. In addition, occupational inequality within categories of family and education have hardly changed for whites. Had credentialism grown as a tendency over the period, we might have expected (1) between-education variation to increase (it did) and (2) within-education variation to decrease (it did not). Were productivity

relationships at work, we might expect both within- and between-variation to rise, as both education and other skill-related (but not measured by formal schooling) characteristics become more closely associated with occupational differences. The same line of argument leads to an expectation that on-the-job training and other skills become more central in earnings differentials within jobs. While we report on these anslyses elsewhere (Featherman and Hauser, 1975b), we find that male earnings are less determined by family, schooling and occupation level in 1973 than in 1962 (controlling also for weeks worked), even as the (constant) dollar returns to each year of schooling have increased in the period. While somewhat equivocal in meaning, these data are not inconsistent with the view that productivity relationships, not credentialism, were the major force behind the rising returns to schooling since 1962.

TABLE 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Status Variables, Nonblack Men Aged 25-64 in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, March 1962 and March 1973

	1962			1973			Arithmetic Change	
	Means	Standard Deviation	Coeff. of Variation	Means	Standard Deviation	Coeff. of Variation	Means	Coeff. of Variation
Total, aged 25-64								
Father's Occupation	28.09	21.27	.757	30.15	22.57	.749	2.06	-.008
Current Occupation	39.25	24.44	.623	42.58	25.22	.592	3.33	-.031
Aged 25-34								
Father's Occupation	30.36	21.75	.716	33.96	23.93	.705	3.60	-.011
Current Occupation	40.37	24.96	.618	42.74	24.95	.584	2.37	-.034
Aged 35-44								
Father's Occupation	28.74	21.78	.758	30.13	22.42	.744	1.39	-.014
Current Occupation	40.66	24.71	.608	44.59	25.45	.571	3.93	-.037
Aged 45-54								
Father's Occupation	26.56	20.45	.770	28.01	21.41	.764	1.45	-.006
Current Occupation	38.11	23.57	.618	43.13	25.27	.586	4.02	-.032
Aged 55-64								
Father's Occupation	25.86	20.44	.790	26.52	20.92	.789	0.66	-.001
Current Occupation	36.89	24.23	.657	38.63	24.88	.644	1.74	-.013

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Occupational Status Variables Black Men Aged 25-64 in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, March 1962 and March 1973

	1962			1973			Arithmetic Change	
	Means	Standard Deviation	Coeff. of Variation	Means	Standard Deviation	Coeff. of Variation	Means	Coeff. of Variation
Total, aged 25-64								
Father's Occupation	16.15	12.88	.798	15.95	13.72	.860	-0.20	.062
Current Occupation	17.77	15.16	.853	25.76	20.44	.793	7.99	-.060
Aged 25-34								
Father's Occupation	17.36	15.34	.884	17.66	15.61	.884	0.30	.000
Current Occupation	18.30	16.34	.893	29.10	21.74	.747	10.80	-.146
Aged 35-44								
Father's Occupation	14.79	11.26	.761	16.32	14.20	.870	1.53	.109
Current Occupation	19.24	16.05	.834	27.66	21.34	.772	8.42	-.062
Aged 45-54								
Father's Occupation	16.24	11.58	.713	14.39	11.90	.827	-1.85	.114
Current Occupation	17.19	13.85	.806	23.43	18.66	.796	6.24	-.010
Aged 55-64								
Father's Occupation	16.36	12.55	.767	14.06	10.35	.736	-2.30	-.031
Current Occupation	14.94	12.70	.850	18.72	16.06	.858	3.78	.008

TABLE 3

Racial Differences in Average Occupational Statuses and in Socioeconomic Variation, Men Aged 25-64 in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, March 1962 and March 1973

	1962			1973			Arithmetic Change	
	Means	Standard Deviation	Coeff. of Variation	Means	Standard Deviation	Coeff. of Variation	Means	Coeff. of Variation
Total, aged 25-64								
Father's Occupation	11.94[a]	8.39[a]	-.041[a]	14.20	8.85	-.111	2.26	-.070
Current Occupation	21.48	9.28	-.230	16.82	4.78	-.201	-4.66	.029
Aged 25-34								
Father's Occupation	13.00	6.41	-.168	16.30	8.32	-.179	3.30	-.011
Current Occupation	22.07	8.62	-.275	13.64	3.21	-.163	-8.43	.112
Aged 35-44								
Father's Occupation	13.94	10.52	-.003	13.81	8.22	-.126	-0.13	-.123
Current Occupation	21.42	8.66	-.226	16.93	4.11	-.201	-4.49	.025
Aged 45-54								
Father's Occupation	10.32	8.87	.057	13.62	9.51	-.063	3.30	-.012
Current Occupation	20.92	9.72	-.188	19.70	6.61	-.210	-1.22	-.022
Aged 55-64								
Father's Occupation	9.50	7.89	.023	12.46	10.57	.053	2.96	.030
Current Occupation	21.95	11.53	-.193	19.91	8.82	-.214	-2.04	-.021

[a]Positive difference indicates higher white value and conversely a negative difference indicates higher black value.

Source: Tables 1 and 2

TABLE 4

Average Intergeneration Occupational Status Mobility, Men Aged 25-64 in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, by Color, March 1962 and March 1973

Type of Mobility	1962		1973	
	Nonblack	Black	Nonblack	Black
		Total, aged 25-64		
Father-current occupation	11.16	1.62	12.43	9.81
		Aged 25-34		
Father-current occupation	10.01	.94	8.78	11.44
		Aged 35-44		
Father-current occupation	11.92	4.45	14.46	11.34
		Aged 45-54		
Father-current occupation	11.55	.95	15.12	9.04
		Aged 55-64		
Father-current occupation	11.03	-1.42	12.11	4.66

Source: Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 5

Means and Standard Deviations of Family Background and Education Variables, Men Aged 25-64 in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, by Race, in March 1962 and March 1973

	Nonblack			Black		
	1962	1973	Change	1962	1973	Change
Total, aged 25-64						
Father's education	7.99	8.59	0.60	5.95	6.54	0.59
	(3.90)[a]	(4.01)	(0.11)	(3.82)	(3.86)	(0.04)
Siblings	4.10	3.66	-0.44	5.15	5.10	-0.05
	(2.73)	(2.64)	(-0.09)	(3.00)	(2.96)	(-0.04)
Farm origin	0.29	0.23	-0.06	0.49	0.40	-0.09
	(0.46)	(0.42)	(-0.04)	(0.50)	(0.49)	(-0.01)
Broken family	0.15	0.15	0.00	0.32	0.33	0.01
	(0.36)	(0.35)	(-0.01)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.00)
Education	10.96	12.01	1.05	7.94	10.02	2.08
	(3.43)	(3.16)	(-0.27)	(4.02)	(3.54)	(-0.48)
Aged 25-34						
Father's education	8.73	9.89	1.16	7.06	7.64	0.58
	(3.72)	(3.87)	(0.15)	(3.65)	(3.71)	(0.06)
Siblings	3.59	3.18	-0.41	4.92	5.07	0.15
	(2.66)	(2.42)	(-0.24)	(3.13)	(2.94)	(-0.19)
Farm origin	0.21	0.14	-0.07	0.36	0.26	-0.10
	(0.41)	(0.35)	(-0.06)	(0.48)	(0.44)	(-0.04)
Broken family	0.15	0.13	-0.02	0.27	0.32	0.05
	(0.36)	(0.34)	(-0.02)	(0.44)	(0.47)	(0.03)
Education	11.90	12.74	0.84	9.59	11.59	2.00
	(3.11)	(2.77)	(-0.34)	(3.21)	(2.58)	(-0.63)
Aged 35-44						
Father's education	7.99	8.53	0.54	6.09	6.75	0.66
	(3.92)	(3.89)	(-0.03)	(3.57)	(3.63)	(0.06)
Siblings	3.96	3.59	-0.37	4.95	4.99	0.04
	(2.70)	(2.67)	(-0.03)	(3.02)	(3.01)	(-0.01)
Farm origin	0.28	0.22	-0.06	0.47	0.36	-0.11
	(0.45)	(0.42)	(-0.03)	(0.50)	(0.48)	(-0.02)
Broken family	0.15	0.15	0.00	0.33	0.34	0.01
	(0.36)	(0.35)	(-0.01)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.00)
Education	11.33	12.24	0.91	8.25	10.40	2.15
	(3.29)	(3.20)	(-0.09)	(4.12)	(3.23)	(-0.89)
Aged 45-54						
Father's education	7.55	7.87	0.32	5.69	5.69	0.00
	(3.92)	(3.90)	(-0.02)	(3.87)	(3.92)	(0.05)
Siblings	4.36	3.86	-0.50	5.48	5.10	-0.38
	(2.72)	(2.69)	(-0.03)	(2.82)	(2.91)	(0.09)
Farm origin	0.32	0.27	-0.05	0.57	0.50	-0.07
	(0.47)	(0.45)	(-0.02)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.00)
Broken family	0.16	0.16	0.00	0.36	0.32	-0.04
	(0.37)	(0.36)	(-0.01)	(0.48)	(0.47)	(-0.01)
Education	10.50	11.70	1.20	7.27	8.96	1.69
	(3.38)	(3.17)	(-0.21)	(3.96)	(3.69)	(-0.27)

TABLE 5 (continued)

	Nonblack			Black		
	1962	1973	Change	1962	1973	Change
Aged 55-64						
Father's education	7.40	7.31	-0.09	4.00	4.94	0.94
	(3.92)	(3.91)	(-0.01)	(3.73)	(3.55)	(-0.18)
Siblings	4.72	4.30	-0.42	5.42	5.32	-0.10
	(2.75)	(2.72)	(-0.03)	(2.98)	(3.01)	(0.03)
Farm origin	0.39	0.34	-0.05	0.61	0.59	-0.02
	(0.49)	(0.47)	(-0.02)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.00)
Broken family	0.15	0.15	0.00	0.32	0.32	0.00
	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.00)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(0.00)
Education	9.61	10.85	1.24	5.43	7.62	2.19
	(3.63)	(3.35)	(-0.28)	(3.75)	(3.80)	(0.05)

[a]Standard deviation in parenthesis.

TABLE 6

Regression Analysis of Current Occupational Status on Family Background Factors, Men Aged 25-64 in the ECLF, by Color, March 1962 and March 1973

Population	Independent Variables: Father's Occupation	Father's Education	Siblings	Farm Origin	Broken Family	R^2	Constant	Error of Estimate
				1962				
Total, aged 25-64								
Nonblack	.286 (.016)[a]	.873 (.080)	-1.097 (.105)	-5.949 (.662)	-3.245 (.743)	.209	31.00	21.75
Black	.067 (.052)	.563 (.175)	-.221 (.261)	-4.978 (1.318)	-.506 (1.354)	.080	17.06	14.61
Aged 25-34								
Nonblack	.265 (.029)	1.173 (.162)	-1.306 (.207)	-5.502 (1.388)	-4.011 (1.446)	.216	28.54	22.13
Black	.051 (.086)	.837 (.369)	.046 (.417)	-6.822 (2.720)	-.556 (2.781)	.110	13.89	15.64
Aged 35-44								
Nonblack	.277 (.028)	.985 (.146)	-1.167 (.195)	-6.456 (1.225)	-3.372 (1.370)	.224	31.79	21.79
Black	.124 (.115)	.569 (.362)	-.506 (.415)	-7.464 (2.522)	-1.367 (2.667)	.117	20.43	15.33
Aged 45-54								
Nonblack	.331 (.031)	.586 (.149)	-.021 (.203)	-5.113 (1.247)	-1.225 (1.408)	.195	30.77	21.18
Black	.039 (.114)	.264 (.346)	-.313 (.462)	-2.765 (2.718)	.112 (2.631)	.033	18.31	13.90
Aged 55-64								
Nonblack	.254 (.041)	.786 (.195)	-1.006 (.255)	-7.316 (1.559)	-4.438 (1.850)	.191	32.79	21.85
Black	.134 (.119)	.348 (.376)	.138 (.466)	-1.024 (2.915)	-1.717 (2.911)	.047	11.78	12.75

TABLE 6 (cont.d)

Population	Independent Variables: Father's Occupation	Father's Education	Siblings	Farm Origin	Broken Family	R^2	Constant	Error of Estimate
				1973				
Total, aged 25-64								
Nonblack	.249	.866	-1.266	-4.789	-2.472	.181	33.76	22.83
	(.010)	(.056)	(.077)	(.494)	(.533)			
Black	.200	1.062	-.513	-5.009	-1.946	.138	20.87	19.01
	(.043)	(.160)	(.188)	(1.198)	(1.148)			
Aged 25-34								
Nonblack	.232	1.020	-1.454	-1.616	-2.711	.175	29.98	22.68
	(.018)	(.108)	(.148)	(1.043)	(1.001)			
Black	.246	1.180	-.930	-3.861	-1.303	.167	21.87	19.97
	(.070)	(.340)	(.344)	(2.395)	(2.095)			
Aged 35-44								
Nonblack	.232	1.030	-1.379	-5.882	-3.078	.196	35.51	22.83
	(.020)	(.112)	(.149)	(.988)	(1.048)			
Black	.177	.918	-.526	-4.764	-2.621	.099	23.84	20.40
	(.088)	(.361)	(.389)	(2.522)	(2.388)			
Aged 45-54								
Nonblack	.260	.965	-1.162	-4.924	-3.172	.182	34.58	22.87
	(.021)	(.111)	(.147)	(.918)	(1.017)			
Black	.162	.732	-.197	-4.034	-3.113	.081	20.98	18.03
	(.092)	(.288)	(.367)	(2.227)	(2.210)			
Aged 55-64								
Nonblack	.270	.883	-1.053	-7.691	-.631	.199	32.26	22.29
	(.026)	(.130)	(.172)	(1.054)	(1.236)			
Black	.092	.979	-.144	-6.349	.396	.132	16.95	15.16
	(.111)	(.332)	(.386)	(2.429)	(2.409)			

[a]Approximate standard error in parenthesis.

TABLE 7

Regression Analysis of Current Occupational Status on Family Background Factors and Education, Men Aged 25-64 in the ECLF, by Color, March 1962 and March 1973

Population	Independent Variables: Father's Occupation	Father's Education	Siblings	Farm Origin	Broken Family	Education	R^2	Constant	Error of Estimate
					1962				
Total, aged 25-64									
Nonblack	.167	.072	-.242	-3.000	-.576	3.597	.387	-3.47	19.14
	(.014)[a]	(.072)	(.095)	(.587)	(.657)	(.587)			
Black	.046	.196	-.112	-1.424	.418	1.272	.160	6.91	13.97
	(.050)	(.175)	(.207)	(1.351)	(1.301)	(.175)			
Aged 25-34									
Nonblack	.122	.271	-.332	-3.606	-1.762	4.435	.437	-16.28	18.76
	(.025)	(.141)	(.180)	(1.179)	(1.229)	(.165)			
Black	.025	.347	-.066	-3.212	.287	1.830	.207	-0.72	14.81
	(.082)	(.366)	(.396)	(2.697)	(2.640)	(.405)			
Aged 35-44									
Nonblack	.151	.135	-.253	-3.344	-.379	3.978	.420	-7.81	18.85
	(.025)	(.131)	(.173)	(1.066)	(1.191)	(.154)			
Black	.063	.329	-.318	-4.111	-.284	1.153	.181	10.41	14.80
	(.113)	(.356)	(.405)	(2.619)	(2.595)	(.330)			
Aged 45-54									
Nonblack	.189	-.103	-.181	-2.247	1.039	3.494	.373	-1.49	18.70
	(.028)	(.135)	(.182)	(1.109)	(1.247)	(.160)			
Black	.078	-.070	-.108	1.421	.917	1.271	.123	6.51	13.29
	(.110)	(.344)	(.446)	(2.853)	(2.525)	(.358)			
Aged 55-64									
Nonblack	.157	.058	-.381	-5.283	-1.405	2.998	.341	7.67	19.73
	(.038)	(.182)	(.234)	(1.413)	(1.632)	(.191)			
Black	.022	.140	.158	2.054	-.677	1.418	.175	4.42	11.93
	(.115)	(.357)	(.436)	(2.856)	(2.739)	(.390)			

TABLE 7 (cont.d)

Population	Independent Variables: Father's Occupation	Father's Education	Siblings	Farm Origin	Broken Family	Education	R^2	Constant	Error of Estimate
					1973				
Total, aged 25-64									
Nonblack	.153	-.112	-.284	-1.399	.848	4.258	.377	-10.98	19.91
	(.009)	(.051)	(.068)	(.433)	(.467)	(.062)			
Black	.164	.293	-.322	-.286	-.382	2.666	.297	-3.623	17.18
	(.039)	(.151)	(.170)	(1.118)	(1.042)	(.156)			
Aged 25-34									
Nonblack	.135	-.052	-.318	-1.566	.184	4.897	.384	-22.53	19.60
	(.015)	(.097)	(.131)	(.901)	(.868)	(.124)			
Black	.151	.623	-.620	.213	-.756	3.827	.332	-19.34	17.90
	(.063)	(.278)	(.310)	(2.182)	(1.878)	(.372)			
Aged 35-44									
Nonblack	.122	.055	-.277	-2.877	.204	4.300	.412	-12.18	19.52
	(.018)	(.100)	(.131)	(.849)	(.118)	(.900)			
Black	.144	.100	-.149	-.089	.328	3.487	.323	-10.97	17.71
	(.076)	(.323)	(.339)	(2.234)	(2.092)	(.332)			
Aged 45-54									
Nonblack	.161	.028	-.359	-.903	.664	4.183	.378	-9.04	19.94
	(.019)	(.100)	(.130)	(.808)	(.893)	(.119)			
Black	.116	.001	.090	-.294	-1.527	2.406	.252	0.[illegible]	16.29
	(.084)	(.274)	(.333)	(2.060)	(2.005)	(.282)			
Aged 55-64									
Nonblack	.170	.067	-.261	-3.832	2.109	3.601	.365	-3.34	19.84
	(.024)	(.120)	(.156)	(.951)	(1.105)	(.140)			
Black	.076	.535	-.060	-3.774	1.367	1.506	.235	5.62	14.26
	(.105)	(.325)	(.364)	(2.342)	(2.275)	(.299)			

[a]Approximate standard error in parenthesis.

TABLE 8

Components of Intercohort Change in Occupational Socioeconomic Status, Men Aged 25-64 in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, by Color, March 1962 and March 1973

Age and Components	Black	Nonblack
Total, aged 25-64		
Family factors[a]	1.06 (13%)	1.86 (56%)
Education	4.68 (59%)	3.07 (92%)
Residual	2.25 (28%)	-1.60(-48%)
Intercohort change	7.99(100%)	3.33(100%)
Aged 25-34		
Family factors	0.78 (7%)	2.78(117%)
Education	7.12 (66%)	2.01 (85%)
Residual	2.90 (27%)	-2.42(-102%)
Intercohort change	10.80(100%)	2.37(100%)
Aged 35-44		
Family factors	1.32 (16%)	1.75 (45%)
Education	6.48 (77%)	4.23(108%)
Residual	0.62 (7%)	-2.05(-52%)
Intercohort change	8.42(100%)	3.93(100%)
Aged 45-54		
Family factors	0.15 (2%)	1.58 (31%)
Education	3.74 (60%)	3.93 (78%)
Residual	2.35 (38%)	-0.49(-10%)
Intercohort change	6.24(100%)	5.02(100%)
Aged 55-64		
Family factors	0.88 (23%)	0.92 (53%)
Education	2.85 (75%)	3.96(228%)
Residual	0.05 (1%)	-3.14(-180%)
Intercohort change	3.78(100%)	1.74(100%)

[a]Includes paternal (head's) occupational status and education, number of siblings, farm origins, and broken family.

Source: Tables 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7.

TABLE 9

Components of Racial Socioeconomic Differences, Men Aged 25-64 in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, by Age, March 1962 and March 1973

Age and Components	1962		1973	
Total, aged 25-64				
Family factors[a]	8.04	(37%)	8.37	(50%)
Education	7.90	(37%)	2.55	(15%)
Residual	5.54	(26%)	5.90	(35%)
Racial difference	21.48	(100%)	16.82	(100%)
Aged 25-34				
Family factors	8.44	(38%)	9.53	(70%)
Education	5.06	(23%)	-1.04	(-8%)
Residual	8.57	(39%)	5.15	(38%)
Racial difference	22.07	(100%)	13.64	(100%)
Aged 35-44				
Family factors	8.70	(41%)	8.39	(50%)
Education	6.85	(32%)	4.39	(26%)
Residual	5.87	(27%)	4.15	(24%)
Racial difference	21.42	(100%)	16.93	(100%)
Aged 45-54				
Family factors	7.03	(34%)	8.72	(44%)
Education	6.58	(31%)	5.88	(30%)
Residual	7.31	(35%)	5.10	(26%)
Racial difference	20.92	(100%)	19.70	(100%)
Aged 55-64				
Family factors	8.14	(37%)	8.55	(43%)
Education	7.74	(35%)	6.90	(35%)
Residual	6.07	(28%)	4.46	(22%)
Racial difference	21.95	(100%)	19.91	(100%)

[a] Includes paternal (head's) occupational status and education, number of siblings, farm origins, and broken family.

Source: Tables 2, 5, 6 and 7.

TABLE 10

Components of Change in Racial Differences in Occupational Status, Men Aged 25-64 in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force, March 1962 and March 1973

Age and Component	
Total, aged 25-64	
Family factors[a]	.95
Education	-3.32
Residual	-2.29
Net change	-4.66
Aged 25-34	
Family factors	2.31
Education	-5.15
Residual	-5.59
Net change	-8.43
Aged 35-44	
Family factors	.15
Education	-5.39
Residual	.75
Net change	-4.49
Aged 45-54	
Family factors	1.08
Education	-1.46
Residual	-.84
Net change	-1.22
Aged 55-64	
Family factors	.46
Education	-2.79
Residual	.29
Net change	-2.04

Source: Tables 3, 5, 6 and 7.

[a]Includes paternal (head's) occupational status and education, number of siblings, farm origins, and broken family.

REFERENCES

Barth, F. Ethnic groups and boundaries. Massachusetts, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., Inc., 1969.

Bell, D. The coming of post-industrial society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.

Berg, I. Education and jobs: The great training robbery. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Blau, P., & Duncan, O. D. The American occupational structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Boudon, R. Education, opportunity, and social inequality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.

Duncan, O. D. A Socioeconomic Index for All Occupations. In A. J. Reiss et al. (Eds.), Occupations and social status. New York: Free Press, 1961. Pp. 109-138.

Duncan, O. D. Discrimination Against Negroes. Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1967, 371, 85-103.

Duncan, O. D. Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race? In D. P. Moynihan (Ed.), On understanding poverty. New York: Basic Books, 1968. Pp. 85-110. (a)

Duncan, O. D. Patterns of Occupational Mobility Among Negro Men. Demography, 1968, 5, 11-22. (b)

Duncan, O. D. Social Stratification and Mobility: Problems on the Measurement of Trend. In W. E. Moore and E. B. Sheldon (Eds.), Indicators of social change. New York: Russell Sage, 1968. Pp. 675-719. (c)

Farley, R., & Hermanlin, A. The 1960s: A Decade of Progress for Blacks? Demography, 1972, 9 (No. 3), 353-370.

Farley, R., & Taeuber, A. F. Racial Segregation in the Public Schools. American Journal of Sociology, 1974, 79, 888-905.

Featherman, D. L., & Hauser, R. M. Design for a Replicate Study of Social Mobility in the United States. In K. C. Land and S. Spilerman (Eds.), Social indicator models. New York: Russell Sage, 1975. Pp. 219-251. (a)

Featherman, D. L., & Hauser, R. M. Sexual Inequalities and Socioeconomic Achievement in the U.S., 1962-1973. Institute for Research on Poverty, Discussion Paper #275-75. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1975. (b)

Featherman, D. L., Jones, F. L., & Hauser, R. M. Assumptions of Social Mobility Research in the U.S.: The Case of Occupational Status. Social Science Research, forthcoming.

Greeley, A. M., & Sheatsley, P. B. Attitudes Toward Integration. Scientific American, 1971, 225, 13-19.

Hauser, R. On Boudon's Model of Social Mobility. American Journal of Sociology (forthcoming).

Hauser, R. M., & Featherman, D. L. Socioeconomic Achievements of U.S. Men, 1962 to 1972. Science, 1974, 185, 325-331. (a)

Hauser, R. M., & Featherman, D. L. White-Nonwhite Differentials in Occupational Mobility Among Men in the United States, 1967-1972. Demography, 1974, 11, 247-265. (b)

Hauser, R. M., & Featherman, D. L. Equality of Access to Schooling: Trends and Prospects. Center for Demography and Ecology, Working Paper #75-17. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1975.

Hauser, R. M., Featherman, D. L., & Hogan, D. P. Race and Sex in the Structure of Occupational Mobility in the United States, 1962. In R. M. Hauser and D. L. Featherman (Eds.), The process of stratification: Trends and analyses. New York: Academic Press, Inc., forthcoming.

Hechter, M. Towards a Theory of Ethnic Change. Politics and Society, 1971, fall, 21-44.

Hechter, M. The Political Economy of Ethnic Change. American Journal of Sociology, 1974, 79, 1151-1178.

Hermalin, A. I., & Farley, R. The Potential for Residential Integration in Cities and Suburbs: Implications for the Busing Controversy. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 595-610.

Hodge, R. W., & Hodge, P. Occupational Assimilation as a Competition Process. American Journal of Sociology, 1965, 71, 249-264.

Lieberson, S. Stratification and Ethnic Groups. In E. O. Laumann (Ed.), Social stratification: Research and theory for the 1970s. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1970. Pp. 172-181.

Morgan, W. R., & Clark, T. N. The Causes of Racial Disorders: A Grievance-Level Explanation. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 611-624.

Smelser, N. J., & Lipset, S. M. Social structure and mobility in economic development. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Co., 1966.

Thurow, L. C., & Lucas, R. E. B. The American distribution of income: A structural problem. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Treiman, D. J. Industrialization and Social Stratification. In E. O. Laumann (Eds.), Social stratification: Research and theory for the 1970s. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1970. Pp. 207-234.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. The Social and Economic Status of the Black Population in the United States, 1974. Current Population Reports, Special Studies, Series P-23, No. 54. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

U.S. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.